

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the original Office Action, the Examiner rendered a Restriction Requirement between product claims 1 through 24 and method claims 25 through 48.

Applicant elected to prosecute product claims 1 through 24, and all product claims were fully examined, and ,when finally rejected, appealed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

A review of the prosecution history including the Appeal Brief submitted by Applicant clearly shows that claim 24 was in this application and considered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

In view of the prosecution history, it is apparent that claim 24 should not have been cancelled by Examiner's Amendment. To correct this error, Applicant has submitted new claim 49 to replace improperly cancelled claim 24. Claim 49 is identical to claim 24.

Applicant also has presented a minor amendment to claim 13, to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "base film antiblock agent."

In the Decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, the application was remanded to the Examiner for consideration of Shibata et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,217,687. Applicant acknowledges, with appreciation, the fact that the Examiner did not consider the Shibata et al. '687 patent to have any impact on the allowability of claims 1 through 24.

To complete the record, Applicant requests that the Shibata et al. '687 patent be formally made of record.


Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,  
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.

February 20, 2008

Please charge or credit our  
Account No. 03-0075 as necessary  
to effect entry and/or ensure  
consideration of this submission.

By



Martin L. Faigus  
Registration No. 24,364  
Customer No. 03000  
(215) 567-2010  
Attorneys for Applicant